

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 24-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 24 and 25 have been amended. Claim 26 has been cancelled. Claim 27 has been added. Therefore, claims 24, 25, and 27 are present for examination. Claims 24, 25, and 27 are independent claims.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection, Tanaka et al.

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0203992 to Tanaka et al. (“Tanaka”).

As an initial matter, the Advisory Action references an Ortega reference; however, no prior reference of Ortega can be found. Thus, after further review Applicants believe that the Examiner unintentionally referred to Ortega instead of Tanaka. Accordingly, Applicants proceed with the response under that assumption.

The recording medium in claim 24, and similarly claims 25 and 27 includes all of the following: audiovisual content, identification information for identifying the audiovisual content, universal resource locator (URL) information for indicating a location of a related content which relates to the audiovisual content, and data for use in downloading the related content and establishing a connection between a server and the device. Furthermore, the recording medium in claim 24 also *always* includes “universal resource locator (URL) information for indicating a location of a related content which relates to the audiovisual content” which improves the usability of the device. This is significantly different from simply including “one or more of the following: ...”, as previously recited by claim 24. Tanaka fails to teach or suggest including *all* of the recited features.

Additionally, the URL in claim 24 indicates the *related content itself* directly, which is different from indicating the *server* of the related content, as in Tanaka. Also, “the data” in claim 24 is reproduced automatically, and the related content is downloaded from the server if a user requests to download it, which Tanaka also fails to teach or suggest.

Furthermore, according to the advisory action at lines 7-8, the Examiner indicates that “[s]pecifically, paragraphs 0109 and 0111 teaches that CD information contains audiovisual content, identification information, and URL for a server with additional content.” However, if the claimed invention is applied to Tanaka, the “content 10” would have to be recorded in the “terminal 1” instead of “CD-information server 3.” Therefore, the claimed invention and Tanaka are different. Also, regarding Tanaka at paragraph 0111 disclosing that the “URL” is included in the “additional information”, this paragraph clearly states that the “terminal 1” does not have “additional information” unless it obtains the additional information from the CD-information server 3, and since paragraph 0110 describes that “CD-information server 3 also... manage[es]... additional information”, if the claimed invention was applied to Tanaka, the “URL” would have to be recorded in the “terminal 1” instead of “CD-information server 3.” Thus, the claimed invention further differs from Tanaka.

Additionally, according to the advisory action at lines 12-13, the Examiner states that “[t]he examiner wishes to state that Ortega does teach such connecting with the server and downloading of related information, since a URL is utilized to find a server and download additional data (paragraphs 0117, 0122, 0318)” However, paragraphs 0117 and 0122 only discuss the contents server 7, which never discloses that “a URL is utilized to find a server and download additional data.” Specifically, Tanaka at paragraph 0318 discloses a song list which is not obtained from the terminal 1 unless the terminal 1 accesses the distribution server 5 (see Fig. 16). Therefore, the additional information which has the URL will also not be obtained from the terminal 1 unless it accesses the distribution server 5, which differs from the claimed invention.

Further, Tanaka fails to teach or suggest “wherein a CD identifier is read once a CD is inserted, containing information such as URL location and server information” as recited by claim 24. However, the URL will not be obtained from the CD identifier even if the CD is inserted and reproduced, since the CD identifier generally does not include URL information. Presently, databases which provide names of CD titles such as Cddb are often used; however, an apparatus which reproduces the recording medium basically connects to a server of the database by reading the URL of the server from a memory of the apparatus itself (instead of reading the URL from the recording medium), because the URL of the server is stored in the

memory of the apparatus. In the claimed invention, the URL is read from the recording medium, so the claimed invention and the conventional apparatus are different, and Tanaka does not differ from the conventional apparatus, but instead merely describes same apparatus as the conventional apparatus. Thus, there is no way for Tanaka to obtain URL information just from reproducing the CD identifier.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Tanaka fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 24, and similarly claims 25 and 27. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 24 and 25 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Gray/

Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:cmb

61857890 v1